



# ***Mansfield Education Association***

Mansfield, Connecticut  
Web <http://www.mansfieldea.org>

April 15, 2010

Dear Members of the Mansfield Board of Education:

As per your request, the membership of the Mansfield Education Association has responded to the questions posed regarding the advantages and disadvantages of the different school building options.

After forming a committee of interested members, we determined that it was necessary to survey our membership in order to gather as much information as possible. The survey was distributed to all certified staff members Pre-K through Grade 8.

The attached packet includes all of the responses collected from the survey. It was our understanding that you were seeking our professional input rather than a consensus of our membership. Therefore, we are providing the responses as given. Due to the limited time that members had to complete the survey, they were encouraged to answer any and all questions possible, given the time constraints.

We hope that you will find this information helpful as you proceed with your recommendation. Our membership appreciates the opportunity to be involved in this process. The MEA is eager to continue the conversation if you have further questions regarding the potential impact your decision will have on our students and the future of education in Mansfield.

Sincerely,

Mansfield Education Association

**Question 1: What are the advantages for a one school scenario for - teacher collaboration, teacher planning and articulation between grade levels?**

- All staff in one building would make it easier to implement grade level changes or improvements.
- Shared resources (Alphasmarts, Clickers, wireless laptops, A/V equipment etc.) are in one place and easier to track, repair and share.
- PD can be consolidated. Everyone is in the same place there are more options for just in time training, and scheduled PD offerings.
- Curriculum ideas can be unified and shared, especially in technology.
- There is less time and energy to implement change with one administrative team rather than working out similar problems and solutions 3X
- It would be easier for teachers (and administrators) to ensure equitable instruction across a grade level or team level. Sometimes the "variations" in curriculum delivery are very different in a 3 school scenario. Easier to keep the quality consistent and to help a teacher who needs it.

All in one building

everyone is at one location - no travel involved

There are no advantages in such a scenario if teachers are not given time each week to actually meet/collaborate as a team or grade level. In addition, video conferencing could be taken advantage of more often thus negating the need for everyone to be in the same physical space.

Uniformity and ease of communication across all prek-4 classrooms. Ability to streamline services and bigger teams to brainstorm and share resources with. Kids can have lots of different opportunities to make new friends and aren't "stuck with" the same group of 30 kids for 6 years.

Advantages for a one school scenario for teacher collaboration, teacher planning and articulation between grade levels would be more teachers involved in sharing ideas, more personalities and teaching styles to place children with, more staff means more flexibility in regards to creating solutions to grouping/placement of students, planning between or across grade level projects, etc. Consistency of what every student receives in regards to instruction and activities would be an advantage. A shared culture and mission would be developed, as opposed to two or three separate cultures and missions.

It is more difficult...cannot think of any advantages

Curriculum council's coordination could be more consistent.

Common "language" and expectations for kids can be implemented more easily.

All grades would have the same SRBI records which would be more easily transferable and usable by the middle school.

Every student and teacher is on the "same page" with procedures such as planners, hallway expectations, etc. Also students already know each other and it is less of a transitional shock when you are suddenly surrounded by strangers.

I would have another art teacher in the building with whom to collaborate.

In one building it is easier to communicate.

The advantage is that they are all closer together and can get together more often; also sharing of supplies.

All of the above would improve. More consistency across grade levels, schools.

- All grade level teachers are together in 1 school and grade level collaboration can happen more often

- By having all the teachers at one school it will be easier for all teachers to stay closer together with pacing of subject matter
- Makes articulation easier because everyone is together at one school
Less travel time on PD days.
The concept of all personnel in one building would create more opportunities for face to face dialogue.
Assuming there is common planning time, collaboration, planning, and articulation WITHIN grade levels could be enhanced... more ideas. More commonality with lessons and activities. Consultants might have fewer meetings to attend. I don't know how it would be BETWEEN grade levels. There's no time for it now.
Obviously all elementary staff being in one building fosters more communication. This will also allow "singleton" staff to have a partner or team (specials, enrichment, psych).
Not sure about advantages
All teachers would be in the same building but that doesn't mean the schedule allows for more collaboration than there is now.
One might say one school would make collaboration, planning and articulation easier, but I don't see how all teachers on a grade level team could be freed up at the same time. I question how it would happen.
Everybody will be together in one building saving money, money, money but losing community, closeness, personal touch. Money is not the most important thing, especially when it comes to children.
Schedules can be established to allow for common planning time for all at a particular level. All on the same page.
In a fantasy world this would be great, but how can 7-8 teachers get common planning time? Who would be with the students? Would we have half days?
It allows the collaborative team to build on individual teacher's strengths.
More opportunity for grade level collaboration and planning for across district consistency
Having everyone in one place makes all of the situations mentioned above much easier. Common language and general procedures would be at an advantage.

<b>Question 2: What are the disadvantages for a one school scenario for - teacher collaboration, teacher planning and articulation between grade levels?</b>
It is sometimes easier to work within a group of 3-4 to accomplish a task.
Coordination of meeting times
It is likely not possible to have everyone free at the same time to meet. It can be more difficult to get things done with a large group. There is less staff in this scenario, which diminishes the availability of personnel to provide coverage for teacher collaboration, planning and articulation.
As in the first response, I see no disadvantages for such a scenario either; if teachers are given uninterrupted time to collaborate. I do wonder, however, how the scheduling or grouping of teachers on a grade level would allow all of them to meet at the same time anyway. In addition, differences that make each school a unique place would be lost. Grouping everyone together would mean that teachers would need to drop special projects they might do or be forced to adopt an activity/project they have chosen not to do. (IE class plays, Special persons day, ...)
It can be difficult to reach consensus with a large group. I would worry about services and

staff being too streamlined and having unmanageable caseloads.
Disadvantages are too many people to form a cohesive grade level team with opportunities to collaborate in one group at the same time. The larger the group the harder it is to come to consensus on issues have meaningful discussions and allow for individual teachers to feel their voice is being heard by the group. One large group would by virtue of its size need to be divided into smaller groups for planning purposes, collaboration etc. because logistically it is unmanageable.
Sometimes with more teachers it is harder to collaborate and organize. Large common spaces will need to be that much bigger and more accessible so students are still able to attain opportunities that are currently available. gym, library, etc.
Fewer / Less varied experiences in school community
Administrators are less likely to know specific needs / "personalities" of students / classes
Easier to slip into depending on quantitative data to identify students' issues rather than understanding the "whole" child - therefore harder to "articulate"
More students in one grade level = more time constraints for articulation and at times there would be information being discussed that didn't apply to a bulk of the teachers.
Loss of a small school atmosphere
In all the larger elementary schools I visited the art specialist's schedule was packed. Instruction time for each class was less than the time that we have here in Mansfield. Being in one large school seemed to increase the opportunity to cram the art schedule, and try to do with as little as possible. In one school they had cut to one art teacher, and the second art room sat empty. These possibilities concern me.
I don't see any.
Even though teachers will be closer together, their schedules will be very difficult to fit time in to meet (with planning time differing for teachers due to specials).
More people at a meeting so therefore may be harder to reach consensus
It could become less efficient. When two or three teachers plan, it takes a good amount of time. When meetings include 8 or 9 per grade level, they become more inefficient and more difficult to create unified plans for an entire grade level.
Teacher collaboration would be negatively impacted by the lack of a common planning time for all teachers to meet. Articulation would be very challenging as it would require 8-10 individual conversations about the students you are sending on and an additional 8-10 conversations for your new arriving students.
It might be difficult to come up with a common planning time for all teachers WITHIN a grade level. We would also have more students to talk about, but not have any additional time to accomplish this. I don't know how it would be BETWEEN grade levels. There's no time for it now.
The number of staff to communicate with becomes unwieldy. Can't get everyone together, can't get everyone to agree. Impossible to have end of the year articulation to create classes and about class make-up.
Too many people to try to get together. I can't imagine how that would work. We have a hard time now getting a few people together at the same time.
In a large school it is difficult to find the time when all grade level teachers could meet as there are not enough specials teachers to take the classes. Therefore, although everyone is in the same building it is difficult to get together. The grade level teams would be too big. The

cutting of the staff, as proposed, makes things more difficult to meet the needs of children.
See above. If we got a whole grade level together once a week for a one hour meeting (which is in reality 50 minutes) how much could be accomplished with 7 or more people at the table?
More teachers in one building will make collaborating more complicated with too many people giving input. Teachers' voice and ideas/feelings will be less heard with so many consultants, coordinators, specials people giving their expertise. Teachers will be more stressed out with too much input from others. Teachers may feel defeated with too many "bosses" telling them what to do. Do we really need so many "specialist" people? Experienced teachers really don't need so many "experts" overshadowing what they are doing....it feels insulting in many ways and seems to waste time that could be better used allowing the grade level teachers to meet and talk about their own agendas to solve the problems that arise.
It is very difficult to come to consensus with 7 to 8 teachers in a grade level. Given the short duration of common planning time, making decision that includes input and agreement by all is cumbersome.
Very difficult to have coverage for that many teachers at once.
Articulation between grade levels will be more difficult due to the larger number of teachers across grade levels it will be necessary to meet with.
It can become very cumbersome to get everyone together but not impossible. Also, planning times generally would be difficult to schedule for the same time.

**Question 3: What are the advantages for a two school scenario for - teacher collaboration, teacher planning and articulation between grade levels?**

Compared to three schools it would be somewhat easier to get two schools all "on the same page"
Allows for more frequent, informal collaboration without need to adhere to a strict schedule that can be compromised with absences, emergencies, etc.
There are only 2 locations to coordinate between when you want everyone together. It is not as unwieldy as 1 school, but I still prefer the 3 school model that has more personnel available for coverage and smaller teams to coordinate between. I believe 2 or 3 is better than 1 in terms of efficiency of planning and being able to get to the details of student needs and how they can be best addressed. In a smaller setting it is easier to plan and provide special activities and maintain a sense of community.
Again, time needs to be devoted for weekly uninterrupted time for collaboration/planning. Therefore, 1, 2, or 3 school scenario is not really the issue for me regarding this topic. Would the elem. school take on more a middle school model to allow for team planning?
I think this is a great idea!! We get all of the advantages of having a larger school and more diverse teams and classrooms. WE also get the advantages of smaller schools that we have now.
The main advantage is a smaller group makes it easier for communication and getting things accomplished. I believe that working in smaller groups allows for a more community feeling and for people to feel connected to their school.
More diversity of experiences, but can still coordinate curricula / programs.
It is harder to come to consensus and for everyone to have a voice in larger groups. whether at staff meetings or grade level meetings... easier to address/keep track of needs of students

with a smaller school population
I don't see any advantage over a one school model for this question.
Advantages are that the team of teachers will be smaller than with one school, so more of a chance to find common meeting time. There will also be fewer students to discuss per grade level since it will only be half of the town.
same as above
Two schools could create grade level teams of 4 teachers. This would allow for more opportunity for grade level collaboration, without eliminating the possibilities of entire-grade opportunities for children.
Two schools would need to be carefully defined as two separate Pre-K-Grade four or one districts building for the Pre-K-2 level and another for the upper elementary 3-4 population. Two schools would increase the number of teachers, at one site, that would be available to plan or collaborate.
Probably the same as #1.
Teams will be larger but not so large as to preclude team conversations & planning. More staff may lead to more talents shared with teams.
Better than one large school in terms of number of staff involved in collaboration, planning and articulation.
Smaller school sizes allow for better teacher collaboration-- there are enough specials teachers for all grade level teams of teacher to meet as the specials teachers would have the classes. Smaller grade level teams would be more productive, communicate better and come to consensus more often.
It would be about the same as it is now, I'd imagine. I assume the proposal is to have 4 teachers/grade levels in each of the two buildings, but that may not be accurate.
Everybody will place into two buildings rather than three. This would save money but lose some community, closeness, personal touch, but less than it would in one building.
Team meeting would be just 4 to 5 teachers.
This is a manageable number for making grade level decisions in a timely manner.
May be easier to manage than one school.
Articulation between grade levels will be more manageable than it would be with one large school.
Smaller groups therefore a possibility that planning time could be at the same time. It would still require district meetings to get everyone together.

<b>Question 4: What are the disadvantages for a two school scenario for - teacher collaboration, teacher planning and articulation between grade levels?</b>
Less cumbersome than three schools but still it sets up the School A way vs. the School B way.
travel time to meetings
Larger groups can be less efficient when meeting and there is diminished staff in this option from the 3 school option available to provide coverage for meeting and planning time to take place between and across grades.
Again, time needs to be devoted for weekly uninterrupted time for collaboration/planning. Therefore, 1, 2, or 3 school scenario is not really the issue for me regarding this topic. Would the elem. school take on more a middle school model to allow for team planning.

I think two schools will be just as effective, if not more than the setup we have now.
Truly, I can think of no disadvantages. I think the advantages for a two school scenario are many and would be a better match for our school system in regards to both teacher and parent expectations.
May be inconsistent expectations
Keeping the SRBI format uniform across schools may be difficult because there may be different needs or opinions for how SRBI documents would be meet the needs of each school.
There would still need to be professional time set aside for teachers at each school to meet and collaborate
Less communication.
I don't see any disadvantages.
less consistency across grade levels
Teacher collaboration would still be difficult as team meetings would be hard to schedule for a time when all grade level teachers are available. This has the potential to create mini-teams within each grade level. Communication would be impacted and could create havoc with camaraderie among colleagues.
Probably the same as #2, but to a lesser extent.
Current teams will invariably be separated and spread through two schools. Current school teams working for positive change with our students will be split up.
Not sure
Two schools would be similar to the way we have things now-- smaller teams of teachers working together. This is a difficult question to answer as there have been no communication as to how the schools would be set up...PreK- Grade 4 in both or would there be an primary school and an intermediate school?
This is better than in one building but: More teachers in one building will make collaborating more complicated with too many people giving input. Teachers' voice and ideas/feelings will be less heard with so many consultants, coordinators, specials people giving their expertise. Teachers will be more stressed out with too much input from others. Teachers may feel defeated with too many "bosses" telling them what to do. Do we really need so many "specialist" people? Experienced teachers really don't need so many "experts" overshadowing what they are doing....it feels insulting in many ways and seems to waste time that could be better used allowing the grade level teachers to meet and talk about their own agendas to solve the problems that arise.
Collaboration time, which is already limited, would be further diluted by more voices and opinions to be heard.
We have a hard time planning with three teachers at our grade level.
The strengths of individuals cannot be built upon to the same degree.
Less opportunity for collaboration and planning within the grade level across the district than with one school.
As mentioned before, district level meetings would be necessary.

**Question 5: What are the advantages for a three school scenario for - teacher collaboration, teacher planning and articulation between grade levels?**

You can do small pilot programs to see how they work before committing to a whole district model.

Smaller, more frequent, and informal groups builds familiarity, trust, and support. These become like subcommittees that then meet with the district.

It is easier to schedule meetings within and between grade levels in each school, and smaller teams can work more efficiently. Because of the smaller environment, specialist and support staff know the students well and can provide valuable input in the planning process. More staff is available for coverage in a variety of formats so planning can include all the personnel necessary to meet the needs of students. Staff is more connected, and special school community activities are more possible and less cumbersome to plan and carry out (arts day, field trips, whole-school assemblies, etc.)

This is a moot point if time is not allotted for professional days/half days to do this.

Lack of change and it will be easier to keep doing the same things with the same people.

The advantages are the same as listed for a two school scenario, but even better. As part of a staff in one of the three small elementary schools, we are able to meet both as individual teams and in cross grade level teams at the same time. We also know well every student in our building because we are able to do activities that encourage the whole school to be together such as at town meeting or at our Thanksgiving dinner. We feel connected to our families and our colleagues in a very personal, family-like way which I think makes for just a wonderful culture and environment in our building. I feel so fortunate to have been able to teach in a small, neighborhood school. Collaboration, planning and articulation are much more meaningful when a staff is able to collectively come together towards common goals and work together in ways that are just not possible with triple the amount of staff.

community schools, building close local relationships, strengthening social skills of the child, being able to provide small structure PE, Library, and access to specials like art and music

- Diversity of experiences for students give middle school teachers more to build on in class discussions
- Diversity of programs generate ideas
- Elementary teachers and administrators are more likely to know kids, so understand needs better (for individuals and classes)

Having each grade split between three schools obviously allows for more personal connections between all grade level teachers and students (i.e. three 4th grade teachers would know all of the 4th graders much better) than having a larger 4th grade population.

The smaller the school the more collective ownership there is for each student. Teachers know each other better, actually, you pretty much know everyone. There is a collective feeling of support

Again, none.

I find that this would be best: fewer classes, fewer teachers to collaborate and better chances of having common planning time for collaboration.

A plan is already currently in place for all this and it wouldn't be disrupted.

Ease of communication and time efficiency when two or three teachers plan activities for a grade level. Take, for example, field trip organization, grade level projects, book buddies, etc.

Collaboration, teacher planning and articulation could continue using our current successful models.



Easier to make common planning time WITHIN grade levels. No difference BETWEEN grade levels because it doesn't happen now anyway.
Small teams are ideal for collaboration, articulation and planning. Everyone knows kids in grade level.
Easier to schedule.
Things would remain the same-- small neighborhood schools with dynamic teaching teams who work closely together.
Three small groups can get things accomplished in an n hour.
This is the best scenario. The smallness of the groups allows excellent communication and coordination of time. Students will receive excellent attention and won't feel like a "number", as they might feel in a large school with all students in it.
Feeling of a family atmosphere. In a smaller, neighborhood school, everyone knows each other on a professional and to the extent desired, on a personal level.
More manageable ~ I liked the days when we had grade level PD days run by Marsha Hilsenrod.
Smaller community makes articulation between grade levels easier.
It's easy to get together with people in your building since there are fewer of them.

**Question 6: What are the disadvantages for a three school scenario for - teacher collaboration, teacher planning and articulation between grade levels?**

Sometimes trying to get three administrators and three distinct staff teams to be on the same page is like herding cats. There have been times when resistance at one building undermines the ability to move on an issue especially in adoption of materials, methods and curriculum. Many times the fact that "that's the way they do it over at" is used either as a as a wedge to slow or speed progress.
travel;
harder to schedule meetings between schools
This is a moot point if time is not allotted for professional days/half days to do this
Change can be difficult and initially there will be more work involved, but I think it will be worth it.
We are now down to two staff members at each grade level and I do think that three or four staff members are optimal for diversity of ideas and creativity in regards to planning, articulation and planning. Two staff a grade level can be difficult, especially if philosophies and personalities are very different.
Different experiences / expectations (although it feels like we're getting better at coordinating across schools)
I suppose making sure that all schools are providing equal services to the students. More work scheduling collaboration between schools/teachers. The disadvantages impact teachers, but I think the advantages to having a smaller school are so much greater for students
Again, less communication.
None.
Cross school communication is poor.
Some difficulty in finding time for entire grade level teachers to meet. For instance, it can be challenging to get all grade 3 teachers together.

None
Less commonality with lessons and activities.
It works best within the individual school, as opposed to among the three schools.
It is difficult to get all teachers in the same building to meet and collaborate. The use of technology could help. Things are too scattered.
3 small groups are working separately instead of with common goals so there is a whole lot of "re-creating the wheel" and duplication of effort. There is no time for articulation or common planning among the schools.
I can't think of a reason why this is a disadvantage. We meet three times per year as a grade level to score writing prompts and this seems like enough time to us.
Cost is high.
Not enough uninterrupted time.
Fewer opportunities for grade level teachers to collaborate and plan district wide.
The need to have district grade level meetings. Also, it's hard for specialists to run around to 3 buildings.

<b>Question 7: What are the positives for a single new building?</b>
- It could serve as a positive "reset point" for Mansfield. In terms of PK4 you have the chance to look at everything through a whole new lens. It is a rare opportunity to reinvent the PK4 environment up and down the line from administration to facilities staff. You can avoid what is not working and try to make it better in the new school. It could be a rebirth of energy and enthusiasm.
-Our school parking lot traffic patterns are an absolute nightmare. We place children in unnecessary danger every day. Any new construction project MUST address this.
New facility with improved air conditioning and heating systems.
financial
New and shiny...
Costs are lower and working in a new building would be great.
-State of the art facilities
-Smaller environmental "footprint"
-Interactions with kids from different areas of town - sense of community
Everything is new and updated.... new technology, lockers and storage, perhaps the use of solar power to offset costs. With more students there will be a greater population to glean from special interest groups such as the Nature Club or hiking club.
Everything is new, equipment wise.
Maybe less busing costs.
Teachers all in one place.
Cheaper to run, maintain, everyone is in one place, kids know each other from K-4. There will be fewer administrators therefore less money needed in the budget.
Newer facility, newer supplies, better technology, better chances of having a state of the art building for all students in town.
More cooperation/collaboration on topics. Busing easier. More diversity in PTO.
- More economical and less duplication of services
- All services will be the same within one building and no complaints from teachers that this

school did this and their school did not - More access to LA coaches and math consultant on a consistent basis
Technology placement, shared resources (multiple copies of books), cost savings for some resources (heat, etc.).
Architectural solutions for existing space issues could be addressed. Gym, auditorium, media center and technology issues would be eliminated in a new school design.
Hopefully, the cost savings would result in procurement of a state-of-the-art facility. Decreased need for duplication of materials. More sharing of staff responsibilities.
A new building would hopefully include separate rooms for assemblies/large events/lunch and PE. Building would, hopefully, be planned to be student-centered, and for staff efficiency.
Only that it is new.
Single new building puts all of us in the same building-- It might be good in terms of teacher planning, collaboration and articulation but the disadvantages for children far outweigh the advantages. There is no guarantee that it would be more efficient for collaboration. The school would be NEW. Student placement would have more options. Cheaper operating costs? The plan as is doesn't allow for any wiggle room- what if there was a sudden increase in enrollment?
It would be clean (!), handicapped accessible, better lighting, HVAC, larger rooms.
Saves money, squeaky new and clean facilities, of course, but this is at a cost for those things in life which have no price such as a sense of closeness, community feeling, personal touch. Kids get lost in a big school.
Cost effective.
Clean, modern state of the arts building.
larger proposed early childhood classrooms; much greater capacity to meet the technology of the students; more opportunities for collaboration among teachers
Class sizes at each grade level will be uniform across the district. Resources will be equally available to all students and teachers, not dependent on make-up of students within the building.
Everyone knowing the majority of the students as well as teachers. Possibly fewer administrators (cost saving).

<b>Question 8: What are the negatives for a single new building?</b>
It is big. Without care and work it can quickly become "big box" education.
Large institutions need to become more formal, less personal. It can erode trust and mutual support. It supports anonymity with parents, students and staff. Harder for staff to recognize strangers or estranged relatives that might be meeting students. Easier to slip through the cracks; retreat into your own "space." Size can erode the sense of community.
There would be a loss of community feeling, and less opportunity for individual students to have particular experiences (i.e., a part in a play, chance to share at a town meeting, opportunities for recognition, etc.). Staff is being cut back and therefore the level of contact, connection and access to services students now experience will be diminished. A large school can be impersonal, students can get lost in the shuffle, and a large school can be especially overwhelming for students at the elementary level. Staff can't know every student and their families well, and it will be a less attractive school arrangement for families who are

considering purchasing a home in town. Activities that span all grade levels are often diminished or eliminated.
An immediate effect would be to reduce staff size as was clearly stated in the information I have viewed (two principals, resource teachers, etc.) This would be terrible for our students. In an era of MyRTI, DRA, other assessments and teacher accountability proposals and initiatives, a smaller staff would be put under even greater pressure than we now find ourselves. In the long run, our staff moral and student achievement will suffer.
Managing young children presents challenges in one large school that are very different from managing older children at the middle school. By virtue of the large size of the building and the large amount of people, we would lose the connectedness to the entire school that we have in a small building. We would not know all the children, families and staff because it just wouldn't be possible in a large facility. My own children were part of one large building when they attended elementary school and it is just not the same as being a part of a small school. Activities were always by grade level or partial grade level, school wide functions were so crowded that the opportunities to connect with other families was difficult, traffic in the morning, afternoon and at school wide functions was awful. As a parent, I felt I was just a number to the office and support staff because there were so many of us. I think the children felt that way, too. Our society is so disconnected today and many families do not have extended family that live close by to support them. Our public schools have become a support system for them. If we have the ability to provide smaller, neighborhood schools for young children, the benefits certainly outweigh the major negative which is cost.
Overwhelming for little kids Potentially long bus rides / long days Lose sense of "tight" community Less flexibility for special events (too big to coordinate) Money should be better spent on more essential resources - education should not be about the latest gadgets / technology Harder for kids to be able to get together to play with kids from across town Library SHOULD be "cozy" for little kids
cost and traffic
Lose the family feel of a smaller school. The faculty will be more divided, in that it is impossible to know everyone. Teachers will have less of a voice less immediate access to the principal (just due to logistics & numbers). The principal will not know every student, as they do now, nor every family. Just too many. Grade level meetings will be larger and actually make it harder to come to consensus, or for everyone to feel that they have been heard.
People say they won't have their neighborhood school. I don't think that matters.
Very large, many teachers trying to use the "state of the art" supplies/rooms in the building, losing that small community feel that people move to a small town like Mansfield for.
Safety, loss of community feel to smaller schools
- getting used to being around more people
More opportunities for students to feel anonymous; fewer opportunities for whole-school, shared experiences (plays, Thanksgiving lunches, field days, assemblies, etc.); less personalized placement of students with teachers and in classes; more chaotic drop off and pick up time; fewer opportunities for students to be "monitored" over six years (PreK to 4) by individual staff members, such as music teachers, art teachers, PE teachers, school psychologist, nurse, etc.)
A large building would incite fear in students at the elementary levels that they would get lost. They would lose the personal connections that can exist in a small school environment.
The bigness. Increased traffic in the local area. Longer bus rides for many.
My concerns are tied to size...Too many kids, too many staff.

<p>There is a feeling of community we get from knowing each other, including students' names that is reflected in increased learning and decreased behavioral issues.</p> <p>Valuable whole school events (concerts, plays, field day, assemblies, enrichment clusters) are much more difficult to put together.</p> <p>Reaching out and making personal connections with new families/staff may be lost when we don't know all the kids/staff</p> <p>Families may feel less welcome in such a large place.</p>
Much would be lost in terms of community with one large building.
Too big, lose neighborhood school philosophy; kids would not get the same shared experience because the numbers are just too large.
700 children all under the age of ten in one school are ridiculous. It's not good for the kids. They'd be herded like cattle and remain unknown to many of the members of the staff. Parking and busing would be problematic. Field trips and after school activities would be negatively impacted. It's not good for kids in any way I can think of.
We will lose the closeness, community feeling, personal touch our students are currently receiving.
Recycling: Are we using and fixing the buildings we already have? Are we willing to become part of a disposable society regarding our school buildings? Leaving these buildings empty is a waste of money. Useless old building make a town look terrible.
There will be 3 times as many buses to get in and out. Arrival and dismissal time will be longer. Young children who live far from the building will be on the bus too long. Parents will be more likely to pick up kids if the time on the bus is excessive. Teachers will be in grade level meetings that are not manageable.
Loses the connected feeling
wouldn't want to lose the "warm" feeling that our smaller schools have historically provided, which children and families cherish
Very large population of students (and staff) will negatively impact the community feeling and the ability to work as a cohesive "team"/
Having school-wide activities would be difficult - parking would be a problem.

**Question 9: What would the teachers see as trade-offs regarding the operating cost of multiple schools vs. program offerings?**

<p>We are already seeing those tradeoffs in terms of current budgets. Even though the administrators, BOE, and community have been extraordinarily supportive in these economic times, reduced budgets have their cost. The administrators have worked wonders to squeeze every penny, but we see the effect in places like the slowdown in Smartboard implementation, and little if any growth in PK4 technology beyond a basic replacement cycle. If the equation is as stated, that operating costs will continue to climb and the pattern of having to cut one layer deeper each year continues, it will just be a matter of what will you cut next? The number of IA's? Reductions in specials and specialists? Making more staff itinerant? At some point when you get done paying for the heat, the lights, and the buses, it will get down the people who provide the services.</p>
<p>Media centers wouldn't need to be expanded in this digital age. Laptops and handhelds will be dispensing more and more information. Books should stay, but we won't need more space for books as technology continues to advance.</p>

The financial gain could mean new program options and materials, but the loss of the 3 schools diminishes other types of programming and availability of that programming to all students. Cross grade activities might be eliminated or diminished to within grade (recognition opportunities, town meeting participation, etc.), special projects/clubs may be too difficult to offer to the whole student body so they become first-come/first-serve activities (running club, recorder club, chorus, hand bells, enrichment activities, etc.) Student participation in concerts and other presentations would be diminished (too many students for all to have a stage part in a musical, etc.), and whole school activities and/or whole grade activities become more difficult to offer, organize and arrange (arts day, field trips, etc.).

I think we have plenty to offer our students now in a multiple school setting.

I do not see that there should be any trade-offs. Up to now (not including the current economic situation) we have been able to provide a quality education to our students with opportunities that other systems either have never had or got rid of due to budget issues years ago. Does this question insinuate that if we go with a two or three school scenario that we would have to lose our wonderful programs like languages, computer labs and enrichment classes? If we haven't had to lose them before now, I see no reason that we should lose them if we stay with what we have now.

We need smaller classes more than we need new technology. I'm not convinced that the ONGOING cost to the TOWN (not just the BOE) will be reduced moving to one elementary school. I think it is WORTH spending a little extra to make the kids' educational experiences emotionally richer by having them feel "safer"

The programs are important. Kids remember all the "special" events that happen, field trips, guest speakers, and "way cool" science experiments.

The way I see it, I would have a nice new art room but most likely not a very nice schedule. I would not want to teach only two or three grades, it would drive me crazy (and be very boring) to be only the K-1 or 3-4 art teacher. So if we had one school I would strongly favor dividing it into two houses, which might help keep a small school feel, So actually what you would be doing is putting two schools into one building, not because that is best, but because that is less expensive. I love the atmosphere of a smaller school, it is so much more nurturing, and as specialists, we all know all of the kids and teachers. This helps to make us more effective, and better able to serve our students.

Less spending on overhead and more spending on direct student services.

In order to keep schools small, the trade-off will be staying in older buildings and "making do" with what you have. Kids don't need state of the art supplies if they have great teachers and a supportive environment.

Bulk is usually cheaper.

Program offerings would be more consistent with one school. There are ways to operate a large school and make it feel like a small school.

Hopefully we won't have to see any. It would be ideal if we could maintain current programming in our current buildings.

Money could be pulled from existing programs such as Spanish or enrichment. Differentiation would be impacted. This could also force an increase in students in each classroom. Some concerns over budget for classroom supplies might force families to incur the expense for school materials or supplies.

Operating costs of multiple schools can diminish available funds for programs.

I am unsure what this question means. I think it is asking if teachers would be in favor of the new school because we would save so much money that we would expand program offerings. I am not sure what programs this would be so I can't answer that. In the short term, it has been implied that the savings would result in tax savings for the community not for more

programs in the schools.
Not sure I have enough information to answer this.
Mansfield has a history of providing many programs to children despite the operating costs of three neighborhood schools. No one wants any programs to be cut. The neighborhood school concept is the most important program to keep!
There has never been a tradeoff, why would this upgrading of the old buildings mean we have to "trade off" programs. Is this what the question means....not a well worded question.
The current offerings are for the good of the children. To change our philosophy based on buildings isn't in their best interest.
Less staffing, energy efficient buildings. Programs would be lost.
I believe that program offerings should come first.

**Question 10: What advantages does a larger school scenario for present regarding the development of a community feeling?**

Unlike some I do think that with creativity and work you can develop a community feel in a large school by breaking groups into smaller segments and putting them back together for larger events. The word on the street is that the expectation of some community members is if a one school scenario is chosen, the staff will rise to meet the challenge of creating this community. It will be hard, but IMHO not impossible. Things like breaking grades into teams (Blue Team, Gold Team) or looping specials teacher like Art PE, Music and Spanish with a grade level team for all four years could be done to develop continuity. If you work hard at it, you can do it.
Less travel
none
I don't really see any.
It could be more of a "center" which would be a good thing for the community.
In my opinion a large school greatly impacts the development of a community feeling and I see no advantages.
Whole town sense of community (vs. neighborhood)
Use facilities for town wide events (but MCC and meetings at MMS and EO work fine now)
Little. When a school is that large events have to be divided up, you can never have everyone all together. I have no idea how the music teachers would do performances with the students, as you could only do one grade at a time, and it would be suicide to try to do a performance for each grade every year...let alone trying to schedule rehearsals... You could not have school skate outings, etc. or school Field Days. Each grade level would be its own community, which is I think how it works at the middle school (that's just from outside observation, I may be wrong). Whole school events would be very, very difficult. And how cozy can an all school assembly feel with 700 kids...
1 tight knit community.
Everyone is together and experiencing the same things.
More diversity.
Students will know more students at their grade level before getting to middle school.
Transition will not be as frightening because they will be used to a school about the same size.
It would be difficult to maintain a community feeling with one building.



Development of a sense of community for all of Mansfield rather than for just one part of it.
All students and staff would have the common experience of attending/working at one school
No advantage in this regard.
There is no community feeling in a larger school. There is no advantage. School is just too big to foster community involvement, parent involvement. Large schools foster isolation.
There are no advantages. A larger school won't develop a community feeling.
With a large building housing all three elementary schools, we would lose the closeness our students currently feel toward their schools, teachers, etc.
Everyone is loyal to one school.
All students attending the same school. Transition to middle school easier.
diminishes the feeling of competition between schools
It definitely could be done, but developing this would have to be a priority.

<b>Question 11: What disadvantages does a larger school scenario for present regarding the development of a community feeling?</b>
I have listened carefully about the energy and diligence it takes to manage a large number of student bodies in large community events such as concerts, afterschool activities, and activities off school grounds. It would be difficult for staff already stretched with time demands to pour extra energy to make everything work.
Anonymity among students, staff, and parents.
It is easy for students to be a number, "school within a school" attempts often limit the children's experiences to one or 2 grades, and students don't have the same connection and relationship with specials and support staff.
Smaller schools allow for closer parent/teacher/school connections. Unique things each school has to offer would be lost.
Long bus rides!!! Southeast is REALLY far away from some area of town.
Losing the "family" feeling.
see answer to #8
There is pride in being part of a smaller community. EVERYONE (secretaries, custodians, specials teachers) knows kids' names in small school - would not be as doable in large school. Teachers are more likely to see / have ongoing contact with previous students in smaller school.
There is a possibility you may get lost in the crowd.
Too many kids can get lost or overwhelmed in a larger setting.
Loss of individuality
Great care would need to be taken in sending students on as dispersing children into 8-10 placements could leave many children traveling up to the next grade level without a friend from their current classroom. Evening events would be impacted as yearly concerts would be fragmented to several evening events per grade rather than the current model of all grades 3-4 together. Grandparents/Special persons day...enrichment clusters...project night and even opening day ceremonies would be problematic in that we could not possibly modify activities to include



the large numbers of children and their families. As a parent of children in a school district with 12 classrooms per grade level...I feel my children are lost in the masses. The administrators don't know my children and communication is cordial but impersonal. This environment becomes highly business-like rather than a warm and inviting atmosphere for families and staff to work together. This is most evident during bus dismissal as it becomes very easy for children to miss a bus. Parent pick-ups and daily fluctuations in children destinations make it almost impossible to ensure the safe departure of all children.
Loss of small school community feeling. Harder for a teacher to get to know all of the students within a grade level.
The number of students and staff would make it difficult to keep the feeling of a community--where everyone knows each other. Common experiences would be difficult--events would need to be separated.
Much more difficult to know each student. Much more difficult to establish a community feeling.
Kids become a number-- and do not have a name. Everything is too big to manage effectively--buses, lunch, concerts, field days, assemblies, school community service projects. All these things become cumbersome.
It'll be harder for parents to get involved; too intimidating. Kids won't leave grade four knowing all of the fourth graders in their school as they presently do, nor will they know all of the teachers. Children take a great deal of comfort in that. Whole school assemblies would be awful to arrange. Whole school/family events would be unwieldy (i.e., family skating, fun fairs, etc.)
With a large building housing all three elementary schools, we would lose the closeness our students currently feel toward their schools, teachers, etc.
When there are too many students and too many families, it is never possible to know everyone. The community, while a common one, is not a tight knit one.
It doesn't give that community feeling. I like the smaller schools blending into MMS.
it might be harder for a family to feel a part of the community as it gets larger
It is harder to get a larger group of people to buy into priorities and programs.

**Question 12: If Mansfield were to lose a significant amount of funding in the near future, (stimulus funds, state funding as result of recent Supreme Court ruling, budget crisis etc. ) - is any option in particular better to maintain programs, classroom size etc.)?**

I am not sure if this is just a rhetorical question? Clearly the lowest cost option of one school provides the biggest buffer against funding cuts, but the question is incomplete. It implies that there will be minimal or no tax increases at the local level, and a view that the basic economics of town growth will stay about the same. I am not sure that you can say that. Will there be more community growth and tax revenue with the downtown partnership? A revival of Four Corners? A project like the Pfizer Labs that was proposed several years ago? The one school option is also the best way to mitigate in lopsided class sizes, to expand or contract services based on needs (an extra psychologist or Art teacher or Sped Teacher, even part time teacher can be added in one place to take care of a need).

maintain classroom size

If the funding for building new schools were to decrease or be limited, it might be more cost

effective to work with what we have. It doesn't seem "green" to destroy existing buildings to erect new ones.
Class size will always be a critical factor in any child's success.
Well if everything boils down to money and that is the only thing you are paying attention to, then I guess you will choose the option that costs less to operate.
Don't spend money building something that doesn't need to be built! Refocus on person-to-person resources more than facilities / technologies. Utilize parent community for support (especially in elementary schools)
Keep what we have or go to 2 schools
What are the options to choose from?
The larger, one new school seems the most financial way to go. Or do nothing at all for a few years until the economy does get better. What "needs" have to be done should be looked at first.
Band-Aid approach to keeping 3 schools a way to pick and choose what needs to be repaired/updated most.
One school option would be better because where it now might take 8 teachers at a grade level; it might be possible to use 7. It might cause less anxiety for teachers who have to be moved from a grade level, it would not involve changing schools and getting used to new teachers, new administrator, new specials teachers, etc. One greenhouse would be more economical
This is a big concern. If we were to lose funding from something such as a state budget crisis, and we were to lose some of the state reimbursement for the building, then we could end up with both a less personalized school arrangement and less funding to keep classes small.
I feel I cannot speculate on an answer as there are many financial matters involved in every scenario. It is difficult to see any option as too expensive if it is truly what is best for the children.
One school
2 or 3 schools
Depending on enrollment, the two school building option seems to be the best one id we were to build- new neighborhood schools, energy efficient while maintaining the community feeling. Building a "big box" school should not be an option for Mansfield. Building two new schools is the best option. If funding disappears Mansfield should renovate two of the school, Southeast and Vinton and close Goodwin.
Keep the buildings we currently have and continue to fix them with the minimal cost.
Stay with the buildings we have and repair them as we can.
funding is of critical importance - it appears that the state is setting the guidelines for obtaining needed funds
We definitely have great programs and excellent class sizes. I would see these areas as a priority.

**Question 13: What advantages would a new LEED certified building give with regard to instruction, programs etc.?**

I am not sure I understand all the aspects of LEED to comment about how it impacts instruction. On our visitations we saw great examples of how lighting adjusts to optimum levels

compensating for daylight and systems to reduce the overall carbon foot print, but I until I see it all in place it is hard to comment on instruction.
unsure
None in terms of instruction and programming that I can see.
It would be setting a good example for the kids and also be better for the world we all live in.
None that I am aware of.
LEED?
I am not completely aware of what LEED would mean to how the classroom would change: this is an example of the amount of teacher training that would be needed.
In the arts, i see mostly negatives, other than new room/equipment
I don't know what LEED means.
See above.
Heating would be more consistent and eliminate hot and cold spots.
Technology, bigger classrooms.
I am not familiar enough with this to comment.
I don't see any advantage to instruction or programs. But it is the responsible way to proceed.
I'm not sure what LEED certified means but I'm guessing it's related to efficiency. I'm hoping the modern building will be designed to best meet the needs of students.
There is no advantage to LEED with regard to instruction, programs. Any savings should be directed toward smaller class sizes and providing badly needed services for children.
Our programs and instruction would be more institutionalized; we would all be doing pretty much the exact same thing. I do not consider this an advantage, but a great disadvantage that takes away teacher and classroom identity.
Not sure
even more consistency and continuity with the curriculum which we have been working hard on as a district

<b>Question 14: What are the positives regarding declining enrollment and its effect on instructional programs?</b>
More programs available to a greater number of students.
More students have opportunities for participation in school offerings
There are no advantages to declining enrollment unless the enrollment was too large to begin with.
Small case loads and the ability to plan and deal with problem rather than always putting out fires and dealing with crises.
I haven't seen positives or negatives; we have continued to deliver a quality education in this town through whatever changes Mansfield has gone through.
Haven't noticed any decline in my classes! Seems like there are always new kids coming in! But smaller classes help kids get more attention.
More personal attention for students to develop interests and skills.
smaller class size
In theory, smaller class sizes
Fewer students means more time a teacher can spend with each student.
smaller class sizes
Low teacher-student ratios create ideal environments to meet all student needs.
Smaller class sizes better enable teachers to meet student needs (assuming the declining

enrollment doesn't reduce the number of classes within a grade level).
I think enrollment increases and decreases all the time. One large school would absorb these fluctuations easier.
There are no positives regarding declining enrollment and its effect on instructional programs unless the staffing remains the same and we have the smaller class sizes, especially in preschool.
We have smaller class sizes, it seems and this is so excellent to reach all students. With a smaller class size, we really don't need too many consultants, coordinators and specialists in specific subject areas, since we can manage on our own.
I think there are many positions which can be cut. Those positions which have been "new" ones over the last decade or so, ones that are not specific classroom teachers because classroom teachers are always needed day in and day out according to the population.
If it equates to smaller class size, that would be an advantage.
I don't think there is an advantage to declining enrollments.
I don't want to lose the terrific programs and resources that Mansfield is known for providing to children. If we can maintain them through this building choice, I'm for it!

<b>Question 15: What are the negatives regarding declining enrollment and its effect on instructional programs?</b>
In a two or three building scenario it becomes difficult to maintain program levels less and less staff. We see that at Goodwin with its low numbers. Clearly with their size it is hard to keep services in place while the staff to student ratio in specialty areas becomes less and less equitable between buildings. When enrollment drops the cost of service per pupil rises and at some point you end up having to say it is too expensive to maintain. You then reduce staff or make them shared staff, outsource services or re-district to maintain equity for teachers and staff.
Less money for programs.
The pressure to reduce staff will increase which in turn will affect the quality of instruction and ultimately student achievement.
All of us losing our jobs. Small classroom sizes can be a big advantage, but if they are too small it can be a disadvantage.
see #14
Fewer kids' experiences, enthusiasm and energy to tap into for classes.
Fewer families involved in the school system - risk not understanding the depth and breadth of services and the tireless commitment of the professional working in the schools.
loss of teachers and IAs
In reality, bigger class sizes and fewer teachers.
Inclination to not replace staff and do more with less.
If declining enrollment means we have to cut staff, there would be a negative effect. One might think that the effect wouldn't be significant because there would be fewer children to serve. However, due to our expanding preschool programs and due to increasing demands and needs for interventions from RTI, we actually need more and more support staff and must maintain good, small class sizes.
Declining enrollment has impacted each school differently. One school has experienced a significant decline in students allowing staff to create fun and exciting learning opportunities.

The number of classes within a grade level are reduced, thereby increasing class size.
Resulting staff cuts is certainly negative in meeting the needs of our children.
Declining enrollment means larger class sizes, reduction in teachers and support staff and resulting in reduction in the amount of opportunities/services for children.
Teachers, who love the school they are in, must leave it to venture out into a new school. Teachers may be laid off depending upon enrollment. With a smaller class size, we really don't need too many consultants, coordinators and specialists in specific subject areas, since we can manage on our own. I think there are many positions which can be cut. Those positions which have been "new" ones over the last decade or so, ones that are not specific classroom teachers because classroom teachers are always needed day in and day out according to the population.
Programs will be cut. Less minutes for art, music, PE.

<b>Question 16: What are the positives of our current buildings?</b>
They are small cozy and everyone knows each other. Our parents are tremendous. It is easy to try something new in a small setting. Teams are small and can make changes quickly.
"It takes a village to raise a child." There's a shared sense of responsibility in the school community that includes students, staff and parents.
It is a wonderful community for our young students. The small size allows us to provide varied programs within and between grades, know and meet our students' collective and individual needs, and provide opportunities that are available to all students. Students have ample opportunity for recognition and participation in all areas of the school. The staff and students have developed a family feeling. Students are nurtured and cared for by staff who know them by name.
Unique programs/offerings and staff morale, shorter travel times for students and families.
Small size that encourages the building of community and for staff, students and parents to establish close and supportive relationships. All children know you and you know them. We can have activities that include the whole school population.
Loving, warm and safe.
I've covered this already
They are local.
They are kept up pretty well. It allows for smaller communities leading to a larger middle school.
Small, personalized feel.
The greatest positive of our current buildings is that they create a place where children feel at home and staff treat one another like a second family.
Their "smallness" creates a more comfortable feeling.
Common history and memories, they are currently bright and cheerful buildings.
Our current buildings work well for us-- just the right size to house neighborhood schools for elementary school children.
They're small communities with three distinct individual "personalities" and they beautifully meet the needs of our students.
There are so many positives which completely outweigh the negatives. We have a community of people who have dedicated their work lives to helping Mansfield's students.

We have excellent arts and physical education programs. We have teacher identity and flexibility (though this is less and less lately).
Size
Small community feeling. Children are known by all staff members
I enjoy it as it is. I feel that teachers and children are supported. The school community is caring.

<b>Question 17: What are the negatives of our current buildings?</b>
We suffer from inadequate storage and spaces to accomplish education in the 21st century. Anything we have in terms of a specialty area is converted from some original use (computer labs, data closets, libraries, OT space, and PT space). They are dirty and hard to clean. There is very little cooling and heating is uneven. Our traffic patterns put children in harm's way every day.
The heating and air conditioning systems.
heating problems, the gym/auditorium/lunchroom combination causes many problems and impacts programs
There are none except the needs to repair / retrofit as necessary.
Technology has evolved to a level totally off the radar when these buildings were built and so we have had to modify our classrooms to fit new technology. This has sometimes created issues with using space as optimally as we would like.
Limitations of space/electrical and large gatherings?
MMS- Roof, windows need major improvements. Office is not appropriately located for safety.
Middle school science classrooms are in need of serious repair. They are NOT handicapped accessible, the designer placed outlets under the sinks, no air exchange in storage rooms and office.
already stated
They are outdated and in need of money to bring them up to today's standards.
They are old and will need updates more and more.
Utilities are old an inefficient, many classrooms are not age appropriate in terms of student size versus equipment/furniture.
old building that are not very efficient
Offices aren't near main entrances; some classrooms could use more space.
A negative of our current buildings is that they need architectural updating with new spaces for an enhanced media center and a separate gymnasium.
They are aging and cramped.
Probably not efficient, costly to maintain.
The combined auditorium, cafeteria, and gymnasium cripple a school at times. This cost saving measure with the last renovation project was a huge mistake. The heating system needs upgrading.
They're old and dirty and the heating and cooling is awful.
Dust, buildings which are expensive to operate. Building cost and energy efficiency are physical problems, our students and teachers love the smallness and comfort of our buildings just as they are.
condition
Repairs!!

**Question 18: What are the educational impacts of a single school building project?**

In some respects I agree that most of education happens between that teacher and her class when the door closes. In that sense that does not impact the education. It is the things that surround that classroom that give pause. Transition times moving kids from place to place; adequate access to specialists, making sure that individual attention is given where needed. I do think that the reduction in overall staff is a concern. In our three building we have three principals with six eyes and three brains thinking about the kids in their charge. Same for all the specialty areas. Less capacity in that area speaks to less adult attention per kid and that is a concern.

Students can feel isolated and "slip through the cracks" socially and academically

keeping track of every child's needs by the entire school team will be more difficult, hard to provide a nurturing community environment, staffing is decreased so services will be negatively impacted, less individual opportunities for students to participate in special activities, to receive recognition, etc., less opportunity for whole school/multi-grade activities...

Staff reductions will result in lower student achievement through the loss of personal and the services they provide. In this time of "DO MORE", how can we meet these challenges with less staff?

The impact is very minimal as the students continue to be educated in their current building and are not exposed to construction disruptions.

See # 1-8

already said

Education will be the same.

Smaller communities stop one grade from getting an over-all "attitude." With one school a grade can become mono-personality (if that makes sense) and sometimes that can be bad.

students have a better chance of receiving the same educational experiences

Consolidation of services - need less employees i.e. 2 nurses instead of 3, and the same goes for art, PE, , maintenance staff, cafeteria services, etc.

Enormous. It would completely change the nature of how we operate and structure our programs. This would be more than just a building change.

A single building could eliminate several teaching positions and reduce programs to state allowed bare minimums.

It all depends on the level of funding the Town commits to. In theory, the less costly the building project is, the more money is available for staffing and programs. At the same time, there would be some savings in staffing and program requirements.

The loss of our schools will be sad for all. The new school will have to be so large that it will impact our teaching.

The impact would be minimal if the school is built behind Southeast.

It is a negative. More teachers in one building will make collaborating more complicated with too many people giving input. Teachers' voice and ideas/feelings will be less heard with so many consultants, coordinators, specials people giving their expertise. Teachers will be more stressed out with too much input from others. Teachers may feel defeated with too many "bosses" telling them what to do. Do we really need so many "specialist" people? Experienced teachers really don't need so many "experts" overshadowing what they are doing....it feels insulting in many ways and seems to waste time that could be better used allowing the grade level teachers to meet and talk about their own agendas to solve the

problems that arise.
Lots of planning. A big change for the residents of Mansfield. Loss of special programs enrichment clusters, special person' day, young author's day, field day.

<b>Question 19: What are the educational impacts of a two school building project?</b>
The two school scenario still does what I spoke of in the question above. Better, but again you reduce the people outside the individual classroom in the specialty areas and you reduce adult capacity to be attentive to the most vulnerable of our students. Two schools also set up several half time positions. An example might be a Library Media Specialist who is a constant at a one school library and on top of all the things happening in the school. In a two school scenario that person splits time between two buildings and really works two jobs, part time. You get a half time Library Media Specialist in each building.
Compromised sense of school community.
less negative impact than 2 schools, but will still be a challenge to provide a community feel and provide opportunities for all students
Larger class sizes would logically happen because there would be less space to put everyone. Again, staff reductions would also need to occur causing staff morale problems.
The students and staff would have to contend with construction noise and disruptions, but we have had to do it before and there was no educational impact to students. The staff worked to insure that our students were not adversely impacted by on site construction.
See 1-8
already said
Same.
Gives students a chance to meet other students when entering 5th grade. New opportunities for friendships and interactions instead of the same-ole, same-ole.
Disruption for little gain.
Still big since we'd have to restructure, but we wouldn't be completely changing the nature of how our schools are organized. It wouldn't be quite as significant an impact.
A two building model could allow many existing programs to continue without a reduction in time or teachers. Differentiation could still allow children to receive guided instruction at challenge and extra support levels.
Same as #18, except that the savings potential is diminished.
Splitting staff/students will be difficult for all.
There would be disruption during the building project but we would rise to the occasion and make it work.
Better than one building.
Not sure



**Question 20: How will the building of a single school effect working conditions for teachers?**

This is hard because generally you would think that new space will always be a better solution. For example, staff such as Library Media, Technology, Phys Ed, PT, and OT get access to spaces they have never had. Yet I could imagine if I was in a reduced staff area, such as a Nurse, Psychologist, Speech I would have adjustments to make. In some cases a single school might throw more light on teachers who need to improve practice, but also provide more opportunities for mentoring. In terms of a transition there will be a range of issues that will have to be worked out. Where is my room? Will I stay with my grade level team? How will my stuff get to the new school? Will there be a place for me given my seniority and assignment?

Unsure

more colleagues to collaborate with but a larger more impersonal environment that will be cumbersome for planning, scheduling, and programming, new teams to be formed, new personalities to work with, less specials and support staff will make scheduling more difficult and make it more challenging to meet student needs

For the students and teachers at SE, the noise and distractions would be horrible...the parking a nightmare.

I do not see any effect.

Shouldn't have much impact DURING the building of it. If referencing impact after - see #1-8

I think trying to keep more staff on a grade level performing in a "uniform" matter should be something we tread lightly upon. One of the benefits to our district is the trust and strong belief in teacher capability that leads to creative and engaging teaching. It should be made aware early that this could be lost if we try to bring three schools into one "uniform" school and is something that should simply stay in the forefront of teachers' and administrators' minds.

already stated

They will be closer to each there and able to communicate more often with teachers that deal with the same issues they do.

Transitions are always time consuming and disruptive to teachers. This would lessen the impact as construction occurs.

This could make some teachers (especially new teachers) feel less critical to the operation of a school. It could also reduce the amount of interaction between the teachers and administrators. For new teachers, this could present less opportunity for careful supervision/evaluation.

All grade level teachers would be in one location. Administrators, reading consultants and math consultants would be on site and available to teachers.

Hard to say. It could go either way depending on how the staff is configured.

Staff is concerned about leadership with this. How will this huge transition be managed by administration? We don't know who those administrators will be. Day to day, I will not really know the whole staff. There is potential for me to get to know/work with some great new staff.

Teachers working conditions would change. Partnerships and teams that have taken time to establish would be disrupted and broken up. The reduction in teacher force would severely affect the working condition of those that remain-- same numbers of kids with less teachers and support staff.

It will be a significant transition from having 0-2 grade level colleagues to 2-6. Also only having one administrator would be a huge shift for many and it many negatively affect working conditions depending on who is put at the helm.

see #1 and #2 above
It is the people, not the building that matters. A large building would make the atmosphere less personal.
Lots of activity at the site in which the new building is being constructed.

<b>Question 21: How will the building of two schools effect working conditions for teachers?</b>
This is hard because generally you would think that new space will always be a better solution. For example, staff such as Library Media, Technology, Phys Ed, PT, and OT get access to spaces they have never had. Yet I could imagine if I was in a reduced staff area, such as a Nurse, Psychologist, Speech I would have adjustments to make. In some cases a single school might throw more light on teachers who need to improve practice, but also provide more opportunities for mentoring. In terms of a transition there will be a range of issues that will have to be worked out. Where is my room? Will I stay with my grade level team? How will my stuff get to the new school? Will there be a place for me given my seniority and assignment?
Unsure
more colleagues to collaborate with, less personal than 3 schools but not as large and cumbersome an environment for planning, scheduling, and programming as one school, new teams to work with and adjust to, etc.
Same as above but multiplied by two...
Staff in the two schools affected will have to be creative in working around construction noise and disruptions, but we wouldn't be the first district to deal with this.
Not sure.
already stated
Less communication.
Much more classroom disruption.
Probably less than a single school, but it wouldn't be as significant.
Two small teams per grade level would be an ideal number for effective team work. Sometimes a few people work better together than a larger number.
Same as #20
Issues same as above
The splitting up of effective teacher teams would affect working conditions for teachers. The selection of administrators for both building could affect teacher working conditions.
see above
People make the atmosphere but two buildings would be better than one with regard to camaraderie.
Same as building one school. A lot of construction at both sites.

**Question 22: How wills the building of single school effect teacher recruitment?**

I honestly think that the level of community support, salaries comparable to the highest districts in our ERG and quality administrative leadership are more important than the facility. New construction (while it is still new) will be an attractor, but not a deal breaker. I believe that it is a far more significant recruitment tool that we have managed to not lay off staff in these economic times while other schools are shedding teachers.

The small schools of Mansfield attract many professionals as well as families to the town.

I think quality teachers are less likely to be attracted to a large single school

This would be a nightmare... who stays and who goes...?

We have a glut of elementary teachers looking for jobs right now; I don't think that would be an issue.

Some new teachers might be attracted by the technology/facilities, but I don't want someone who's more interested in that than the relationship with the kids in the school.

This is something that should be researched in other districts to see what new/recruited teachers think going into a school with approximately 8 classrooms in a grade level for grade K-4.

do not know, so may unemployed is really a no issue

I don't think it will.

Most elementary teachers like and appreciate the small community of learners.

I don't think it will.

New teachers might find the large school climate impersonal and overwhelming.

No impact

Big, new, high-tech school can be a draw. More staff to provide support in specific areas.

Teachers coming out of college will jump at any teaching position but the most highly sought after positions are those in smaller schools with good leadership

Some candidates will shy away from a "Big Box" school. People won't view Mansfield the same way. The small schools attract teachers.

not at all

It won't have an effect.

Shouldn't effect it at all

Mansfield is a great place to teach - one building, two, or three!

**Question 23: How will the building of two schools effect teacher recruitment?**

I honestly think that the level of community support, salaries comparable to the highest districts in our ERG and quality administrative leadership are more important than the facility. New construction (while it is still new) will be an attractor, but not a deal breaker. I believe that it is a far more significant recruitment tool that we have managed to not lay off staff in these economic times while other schools are shedding teachers.

Unsure

I think 2 schools is a more attractive option for quality teachers, and 3 schools even more so

This would be a nightmare... who stays and who goes...?

see #22

Not sure.
it won't
I don't think it will have any impact.
ditto
Teacher recruitment would attract teachers who wish to be in a small school, rural community.
No impact
Big school can be intimidating. May not be able to provide new teachers with support.
Two smaller schools would attract the best and brightest to our school district.
Positively; two new, not too big schools is attractive.
not at all
It won't have an effect.
Shouldn't effect it

<b>Question 24: What would be the challenges the district would face in going to a single new school?</b>
A single new school presents the challenge of starting something completely new. New administrative staff structure, a blending of staff, singleton teachers from old buildings now operating as closer teams. The list is endless. It will require ongoing sustained planning in the year before opening. It almost would be worth appointing the lead administrator the year before and reducing or eliminating all duties to concentrate on getting the new school off to a good start. You will have to pay close attention to building a new team from three different schools. We will stumble as we do not get everything right, but with lots of effort it will be OK. We will lose staff by attrition and perhaps not by choice and we will mourn their loss.
Schools are increasingly taking on responsibilities that once belonged to the family. These include hygiene, nutrition, and social support. The smaller the school, the more likely these supports will take place.
Scheduling is very complicated in a large school (i.e., - lunch/recess, specials, dismissal, etc.), maintaining a sense of community is more challenging the bigger the school, providing for student need is more challenging with reduced staff.
I think this has been addressed in the previous questions.
Working with families and students used to being in three smaller schools and creating a community feeling in a large building. Lunch waves and beginning of the day and dismissal have the potential to be big issues that need to have creative solutions. The large staff group would have to have help in coming together as a new collective group as many members have worked for many years in their individual schools.
Severe backlash from parents who would be worried about their kids' welfare, from educators who recognize the importance of "intimate" contact with kids, and from taxpayers who would question spending money on this - especially in these times.
Families are attached to their schools, the traditions etc. which will be hard to give up. It will take time to blend these three school families into one new family, on that will be totally different. Would be a big adjustment for those students who are used to a smaller space, will seem daunting at first for our little ones.
Convincing parents that it is better and affordable...
Funding, busing, moving with minimal impact on instruction, staffing selection, time needed to

plan
We'd have to invest a tremendous amount of energy in creating "SWAS" (School Within A School) environments in a necessary task of creating smaller learning environments. Unfortunately, this time could take away from the work already required of teachers in designing, implementing, and assessing instruction.
Challenges would be greatly minimized with strong administrative leadership. A team leader position would need to be established to create a leader within each grade level. Mansfield teachers are highly adaptable and motivated to make the best learning environment for children.
Parental and teacher opposition
More families leaving the community.
The selection of teaching teams with the proposed reduction in the teaching force. Scheduling issues, transportation issues, programming for students, lunch issues, recess issues, the length of bus rides, bus dismissal, fire drills, parent pickup drop-off issues, afterschool program space, parent conferences scheduling, assemblies, music programs, storage of equipment for all areas, the use of gym/school by outside groups-- the list goes on.
The list is endless: getting 700 kids onto the bus when 2/3 of them can't read, tie their shoes, zip their coats, etc., feeding them at the right time of day, caring for their medical emergencies, supporting their emotional and social development with the proposed cuts to special ed/school psych staffing and primarily meeting their academic needs. Class size will increase and kids will suffer.
This is whole essay of material. I do not have time to answer this now. The survey should have been more "friendly" to fill out.
buses
school events
personal touch
Parent and community anxiety
public will

**Question 25: What would be the challenges the district would face in going to two new schools?**

I think that in this scenario, there will be a period of several years where there will be "old staff" and the new folks as you dissolve staff from 3 and push them into 2. I have noticed that when staff has shifted schools into a new culture, it takes a year, maybe two or three until they get their feet under them and are fully integrated into the school and have built trusting relationships so that they can be a fully effective member of the school staff.

Small schools can offer more to young children in academic and social support.

Scheduling is more complicated the larger the school (i.e., - lunch/recess, specials, dismissal, etc.), maintaining a sense of community is more challenging the bigger the school, providing for student need is more challenging with reduced staff.

I think this has been addressed in the previous questions.

How to deal with the families from the one school being taken away and which school their children will go to.

See # 24.

The transition would be less traumatic in my mind. The families of the school that closed would

have the hardest time. In both cases teachers would have to learn all new routines, get to know and work with new staff, and perhaps a new administrator.
Same.
Disruption of 2 schools while one is untouched will bother parents.
Arranging for the above.
Two schools would be a gift to the children and teachers of Mansfield. I cannot see any challenges with this model. Slight adjustments to current services and/or extracurricular would allow our programs to be maintained and a climate of nurturing would still exist. Happy employees and content parents are a recipe for success.
Same as #24, but perhaps to a lesser extent.
Transitioning is always difficult.
The dividing of the district and where that line falls in our town.
I don't know enough about the 2 school plan at this time to comment on this with any specifics.
Parent and community anxiety